

REMARKS

Independent claims 41 and 42 and dependent claim 43 remain in this case. Newly added dependent claims 52 to 59 are added without the addition of new matter. Independent claims 41 and 42 have been amended so as to remove the statutory double-patenting rejection. A terminal disclaimer is enclosed herewith to address any remaining issue of obviousness type double-patenting.

Claim 41 now focuses on the combinatorial synthesis technique originally disclosed in the specification, such as at Fig. 14a through 14f. The corresponding description in the Detailed Description can be found at page 38, line 11 to page 39, line 8.

Claim 42 has been modified to add the limitation found at least at page 37, line 9.


The preamble of claim 42 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's §112 issue regarding "replicating" the device, as opposed to producing a compliment.

It is believed this application is now in condition for allowance. If minor matters remain, the undersigned requests that he be contacted by telephone at (949) 823-6960.

Respectfully submitted,

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Dated: 1/26/07

By: 
David B. Murphy
Reg. No. 31,125

DBM/dnd

34263

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

O'Melveny & Myers LLP
610 Newport Center Drive
17th Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(949) 760-9600